

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN VINSICK,

Plaintiff,

14cv0006

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

v.

UNIFUND CCR,

Defendant.

Order of Court

And now, this 18th day of February, 2014, upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion to Remand (doc. no. 10) and Defendant's Response in Opposition thereto (doc. no. 14), the Court hereby DENIES the motion to remand because, as more fully set forth on the record, Defendant has a statutory right to remove this action, being based upon the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) (a federal question). See 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

As for Plaintiff's argument that it will be less expensive and more judicially efficient to remand this case, as also set forth on the record, the Court finds that the equities way in favor of retaining this case, albeit involving a modest amount in controversy (\$12,000.00), because the Court will bring this case up to trial in an expedited fashion.

Finally, in light of Plaintiff's explanation of his claims (both in his Original Complaint, on the record at the Initial Case Management conference this date), the Court finds that Plaintiff need not file an Amended Complaint. Defendant's answer is due on February 27, 2014.

SO ORDERED this 18th day of February, 2014.

s/Arthur J. Schwab
Arthur J. Schwab
United States District Judge

cc: All Registered ECF Counsel and Parties